

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this amendment, Claims 1-110 are cancelled. New claims 111-119 have been added. Hence, Claims 111-119 are pending in the Application. It is respectfully submitted that the new claims do not add any new matter to this Application. Furthermore, the new claims added herein are for the purpose of promoting readability and clarity.

## SUMMARY OF REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 53-54, 56-59, 64-66, 69, 70, 72, 75, 79, 80, 85, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,336,124 issued to Alam et al.

Claims 1-7, 9, 13-14, 19-20, 25-26, 40, 43, 106, 109 and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al.

Claims 8, 33-35, 37-39, 44-45, 47-48, 55, 88, 90, 92, 93, 102, 105, 107 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,560,651 issued to Katz et al.

Claims 10-12, 15-17, 21-24, 67-68 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of WO 00/16550 by Gomez.

Claims 27-28 and 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of US 2002/0147047 by Letovsky.

Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of US2002/0144278 by Pratts et al.

Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Pratts et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,835 issued to Lin.

Claims 36 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Katz and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,835 issued to Treyz.

Claims 46, 52, 89-91, 94-96, 100, and 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Katz and further in view of Gomez.

Claims 60-63 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of WO 99/23584 by Friedman.

Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of US 2001/0056575 by Wei et al.

Claim 74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of WO 01/19088 by Swanton.

Claims 73 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Katz and further in view of U.S. patent No. 6,041,333 issued to Bretschneider et al.

Claims 78, 86 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Gomez.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650, 433 issued to Keane et al.

Claim 97 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Rat and further in view of Keane et al.

Claims 98-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Rat and further in view of Friedman.

Claims 102 and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alam et al. in view of Kat and further in view of Letovsky et al.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

CLAIMS 111, 117, 118, and 119

Claim 111, recites in part, the features:

“decomposing each of said one or more input multi-media files into multi-media type primitive components;  
converting each of said multi-media type primitive components into corresponding intermediate format components; and  
integrating said intermediate format components into a single output presentation file corresponding to each target format of the plurality of target formats.”

Claim 111 includes the limitation of “decomposing each of said one or more input multi-media files into multi-media type primitive components.” First of all the technology in *Alam* relates to converting a text document or an image document (i.e., bitmapped document) into a another format for display. See Abstract. Thus, *Alam* has nothing to do with converting several multi-media files as in the instant application. Because *Alam* does not deal with multi-media files, *Alam* does not disclose decomposing the multi-media files into multi-media type primitive components. Examples of the multi-media type primitive components are audio, video and animation primitives. In contrast, *Alam* merely discloses grouping the data that is in an input document into intermediate format blocks. *Alam* discloses grouping the data into intermediate format blocks because *Alam* has to manipulate **only text and bitmapped files** and **NOT multimedia files** which include audio, video, animation, and graphics components.

Further, Claim 1 integrates the multi-media type primitive components from several multi-media files into a single output file. In contrast, *Alam* merely discloses converting a single text or bitmapped input file.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is allowable because *Alam* neither anticipates nor makes obvious the limitations of claim 1.

Claims 118 and 119 contain limitations that re similar to Claim 1. Thus, Claims 118 and 119 are allowable for at least the reasons proffered herein in respect to Claim 1.

#### CLAIMS 112-116

Claims 112-116 are directly dependent upon Claim 111 and include all the limitations of Claim 111 and therefore are allowable for at least the reasons provided herein in respect to Claim 111.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 112-116 recite additional features that independently render Claims 112-116 patentable over the art of record. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 112-116 be held in condition for allowance.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4311.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due to Applicants' Deposit Account No. 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,  
Perkins Coie LLP



Carina M. Tan  
Registration No. 45,769

Date: March 31, 2004

### **Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 22918  
Perkins Coie LLP  
P. O. Box 2168  
Menlo Park, California 94026  
(650) 838-4300